

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/784,566	02/23/2004	Bo Jin	10002.003010 (CD03002)	8641	
31894	7590 02/07/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
OKAMOTO P.O. BOX 64	& BENEDICTO, LLP	HOLLINGTON	HOLLINGTON, JERMELE M		
SAN JOSE,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			2829	2829	
			DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8/1

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summan	10/784,566	JIN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jermele M. Hollington	2829				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 No.	ovember 2005.					
,	<u> </u>					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1,4-6,12 and 16-26 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 1,4-6,12 and 16-20 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 21-26 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:						

Art Unit: 2829

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cha et al (6849928) in view of Nutty et al (6847218).

Regarding claim 21, Cha et al disclose an anti-wafer structure [see Fig. 10] for testing a plurality of dice on a wafer under test, the structure comprising a silicon on insulator (SOI) layer (SOI layer 46); and a plurality of probe dice (pad 42) formed on the SOI layer (46), each probe die in the plurality of probe dice having a pad layout corresponding lo a pad layout of a die on the wafer under test. However, they do not disclose an adapter layer as disclose. Nutty et al disclose [see Figs. 1-3] a silicon on insulator layer (probe card 220), a plurality of probe dice (probe dice 351A-351H) on the SOI layer (220) and an adapter layer (test interface 240) to adapt a pad layout of a probe dice (351A-315H) to another pad layout [not shown]. Further, Nutty et al teach that the addition of adapter layer is advantageous because it increased the throughput and enhance the capability of a test environment by increasing the probe dice so that more test dice may be tested within a given amount of time. It would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Cha et al by adding adapter layer as taught by Nutty et al in order to increase the throughput and enhance the capability of a test environment during testing.

Regarding claim 22, Cha et al disclose a plurality of holes (holes 34 and 36) extending through the SOI layer (46) and the plurality of probe dice (42), the holes (34 and 36) corresponding to pads (42) on the probe dice.

Regarding claim 23, Nutty et al disclose [see Figs. 8A-8E] a silicon on insulator layer (220), a plurality of probe dice (831) on the SOI layer (220) and a plurality of holes (shown not number) extending through the plurality of probe dice (220) wherein the holes are filed with interconnect lines (interconnect lines 855). Further, Kurita teaches that the addition of interconnect lines inside holes is advantageous because cracks that are caused in a solder ball connection can significantly be reduced. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Cha et al by adding interconnect lines in holes extending through probe dice as taught by Nutty et al in order to significantly reduced cracks that are caused in a solder ball connection.

Regarding claim 24, Nutty et al disclose the interconnect lines (855) are coupled to pads (821) of the wafer under test (851).

Regarding claim 25, Cha et al disclose a number of the probe dice (42) equals a number of dice on the wafer under test.

Regarding claim 26, Cha et al disclose the SOI layer (46) comprises an oxide layer (oxide layer 14).

Application/Control Number: 10/784,566

Art Unit: 2829

Conclusion

Page 4

Claims 1, 4-6, 12, 16-20 are allowed. 4.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: 5.

regarding claims 1 and 12, the reason for the allowance of the claims is presented in the

"Remarks" section of the applicants' amendment filed on Nov. 15, 2005. Since claims 4-6

depend from claim 1 and claims 16-20 depend from claim 12, they also would have allowable

subject matter.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jermele M. Hollington whose telephone number is (571) 272-

1960. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-4:30 EST) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (517) 272-1705. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JMH

February 6, 2006

/Jermele M. Hollington Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2829